

EXHIBIT “5”

Debbie Pirkey

From: Ben King [benking@nixlawfirm.com]
Sent: Friday, August 25, 2006 2:08 PM
To: dpirkey@nixlawfirm.com
Subject: FW: DataTreasury v MagTek and CPS Subpoena

--
R. Benjamin King
Attorney - Nix, Patterson & Roach, L.L.P.
2900 St. Michael Drive, Suite 500
Texarkana, Texas 75503

Office: 903.223.3999
Fax: 903.223.8520
Cell: 903.278.5606

-----Original Message-----

From: Williams, Danielle [mailto:DTWILLIAMS@KilpatrickStockton.com]
Sent: Friday, August 25, 2006 12:38 PM
To: Ben King
Cc: Dial, Audra; Nelson, Bruce; david.dillard@cph.com; brian.brookey@cph.com
Subject: RE: DataTreasury v MagTek and CPS Subpoena

Ben-

We are not going to withdraw the motion while the motion for protective order is pending. As far as the document portion is concerned, I hope to be in a position next week to give you an estimate of when we can respond.

Please call me to discuss when you return to the office.

Thanks.

Danielle

E. Danielle Thompson Williams
Kilpatrick Stockton LLP
1001 West Fourth Street
Winston-Salem, NC 27101-2400
t 336 607 7306
f 336 734 2616

Confidentiality Notice:

This communication constitutes an electronic communication within the meaning of the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. Section 2510, and its disclosure is strictly limited to the recipient intended by the sender of this message. This transmission, and any attachments, may contain confidential attorney-client privileged information and attorney work product. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in or attached to this transmission is STRICTLY PROHIBITED.

Please contact us immediately by return e-mail or at 336 607 7300, and destroy the original transmission and its attachments without reading or saving in any manner.

-----Original Message-----

From: Ben King [mailto:benking@nixlawfirm.com]
Sent: Friday, August 25, 2006 9:31 AM
To: Williams, Danielle

Cc: Dial, Audra
Subject: RE: DataTreasury v MagTek and CPS Subpoena

The motion has been fully briefed and there has been no ruling that I am aware of at the time of this email.

Ben

-----Original Message-----

From: "Williams, Danielle" <DTWILLIAMS@KilpatrickStockton.com>
Subj: RE: DataTreasury v MagTek and CPS Subpoena
Date: Fri Aug 25, 2006 8:16 am
Size: 4K
To: <benking@nixlawfirm.com>
cc: "Dial, Audra" <ADial@KilpatrickStockton.com>, "Nelson, Bruce" <bnelson@kilpatrickstockton.com>, <brian.brooke@cph.com>, <david.dillard@cph.com>

Ben-

With regard to the deposition, what is the status of the pending motion for protective order?

From: Ben King [mailto:benking@nixlawfirm.com]
Sent: Friday, August 25, 2006 8:49 AM
To: Williams, Danielle; Dial, Audra
Cc: datatreasury@cooperiplaw.com
Subject: DataTreasury v MagTek and CPS Subpoena

Danielle,

I write to express my surprise regarding the Motion to Quash filed by CPS on Wednesday. In your Motion, the "short" time to respond and/or otherwise comply is repeatedly cited as creating an undue burden on CPS. However, as I have repeatedly informed Ms. Dial, DataTreasury is more than willing to attempt to resolve any potential issues CPS has regarding the noticed dates and times. To date, DataTreasury has certainly been cooperative in working with CPS, and Ms. Dial even noted this cooperation in one of her previous emails. In light of our offers to work with CPS regarding the noticed dates, I was particularly surprised that the time to respond was cited as the main basis for creating an undue burden, particularly because CPS made no attempt to take DataTreasury up on its offer to find mutually agreeable dates and in fact did not confer with DataTreasury before filing the Motion.

DataTreasury again extends its --- message truncated ---